



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

**ADDRESS BY MR. CHAIM HERZOG, PRESIDENT
OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): This morning the Assembly will hear an address by the President of the State of Israel.

2. I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

3. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): Mr. President, in view of the announcement that you have just made, I should like to inquire as to the meaning of the term "State of Israel". Taking into consideration the numerous past resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations, surely the term would not and should not be construed, as Israel alleges, in any manner which runs counter to the clear-cut meaning and definition spelt out in United Nations resolutions which categorically declare, *inter alia*, that the annexation of Jerusalem and the declaration by Israel that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel are null and void and that the occupation and annexation of Palestinian and other Arab territories by Israel are null and void and contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rule of international law.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In reply to the question raised by the representative of Iraq, I must state, as President of the General Assembly, that Mr. Chaim Herzog is on this day attending the General Assembly as President of his country, assuming the personality of the State of Israel as admitted to the United Nations on 11 May 1949. Therefore, the presence of President Herzog here in this Hall in no way prejudices the resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations system in respect of the situation in the Middle East, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and any other matters on which resolutions have been adopted in this Organization; nor does it affect the positions taken in the Assembly by the Member States. I believe that the same applies to the visit by Heads of State or Government of any other Member State.

5. Therefore, we shall follow the tradition established by the General Assembly.

6. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. Chaim Herzog, President of the State of Israel, and to invite him to address the Assembly.

7. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Mr. President, I rise with no small sense of nostalgia to address the General Assembly and in so doing I take the opportunity to congratulate you, a former colleague of mine in the United Nations, on your election to the presidency of the Assembly and to wish you well.

8. As I look out at the Assembly I am grieved and pained to note that the politics of fear still persists. Here, in the demonstrative departure from this Hall of the representatives of some countries, is summed up in the

most succinct manner the problem that Israel faces in the Middle East. Here one sees the problem of the unwillingness of nations to listen to each other, to enter into a dialogue, to try to understand each other. There are countries whose representatives have left this Hall which apply for, and receive, technical and agricultural aid from Israel, which send students to train in Israel, yet which have left this Hall for no other reason than fear.

9. Here the Assembly has been exposed in the most dramatic and telling manner to the core of the problem of the Middle East: an unwillingness to talk, to negotiate; a fear of being exposed to the other side's views. The politics of fear, assassination, intimidation, threat and subversion which motivate all too many countries in the world in general and in our Middle East region in particular are reflected in the behaviour of so many delegations to the Assembly.

10. For years, since the establishment of the State of Israel, representative after representative of our Government, myself included, have stood before the Assembly and declared that our conflict with our Arab neighbours cannot be solved on the field of battle, that it can be resolved only at the negotiating table. We have maintained that we are prepared to negotiate on all issues without prior conditions.

11. For years we maintained that dialogue was the only road to peace and that negotiations, however protracted and difficult, must lead to positive results. For years we maintained that no advance could be made without negotiations and that no negotiations had ever taken place between ourselves and our Arab neighbours without an advance being made. And then, one day, a great man arose in the Middle East and accepted our challenge. The late lamented President Anwar Sadat of Egypt came to Jerusalem, addressed the Knesset, set forth his demands and entered into negotiations. His challenge was taken up by the Government of Israel. The long and protracted negotiations which ensued, with the active help and historic involvement of the United States Government and its President, led ultimately to the signing of the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty and to the Camp David accords, setting out the guidelines for a solution to the Palestinian Arab question. All the territory of Sinai was returned by Israel to Egypt.

12. Today the border with Egypt is open. Israeli tourists frequent Egyptian resorts in Sinai. A bus leaves Tel-Aviv every morning, arriving in Cairo at midday. True, there are problems. Not all developments have been as we would have wished them, but the machinery of negotiation and dialogue exists in the Israeli Embassy at Cairo and in the Egyptian Embassy in Israel. It is sobering and sad indeed to reflect that the United Nations, dedicated, as it is supposed to be, to the peace of the world and to the achievement of peaceful relations between nations, condemned an agreement the most tangible result of which has been the fact that since President Sadat's historic visit to Jerusalem on 19 November 1977 not one Israeli or Egyptian soldier has died in the Sinai or on the Israeli-Egyptian border. Because of the process of peace set in motion by President Sadat's visit, there is not one

house of mourning in Egypt or in Israel as a result of hostilities on the Egyptian-Israeli border.

13. As one contemplates the carnage and slaughter which unfortunately are so characteristic of events in our neighbourhood, perhaps this fact may be considered by some to be of little importance, but to the mothers of Egypt and of Israel it is important. It will be to the everlasting discredit of the United Nations that it was unable to rise above its obsessions and prejudices and to endorse a move of such historic consequence in the direction of peace.

14. Yes, for years we maintained that we were prepared to negotiate on all issues without preconditions. For years every Prime Minister of Israel issued invitations to the leaders of the Arab world to meet around the negotiating table. One great leader of towering stature in the Middle East arose above the pettiness of daily struggle and mutual recrimination and stepped forward to the negotiating table; and that move led to peace.

15. I can but reiterate the invitation extended by all Governments of Israel to the leaders of our neighbouring countries to join us in a quest for peace, not on the battlefield but in the conference room.

16. Indeed, in the past year we have negotiated an agreement with a second Arab country, Lebanon. Again, this was with the active intervention and participation of the United States Government, which has been the major force for peace in our area. In May 1983 an agreement with the Lebanese Government was negotiated and signed and later ratified by the Israeli Knesset and the Lebanese Parliament, an agreement designed to lead to the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon—Syrian, PLO and Israeli. This is to lead in turn to a process of normalization along our border with Lebanon which will guarantee that Lebanon will never again be used for terrorist attacks on Israeli towns and villages in northern Galilee.

17. It is sad and tragic, especially against the background of the bitter events which have occurred in Beirut and Tyre over the past month, that the main purpose of Syria and its Lebanese surrogates at the recent conciliation Conference in Geneva was the abrogation of the Israel-Lebanon agreement. How tragic it is, against the background of the human misery which has been the lot of the Lebanese people since 1975, to observe that an agreement which will advance the cause of peace in Lebanon is the main target of the Syrian Government, in pursuance of its policy of absorbing Lebanon and creating a Greater Syria. This, perhaps more than anything else, demonstrates the inhuman tragedy of the Lebanese situation and the cruel alternatives which face those who are involved. In the final analysis it is the Lebanese people which is suffering a tragedy, the scope of which is difficult to comprehend.

18. For years—during the first three years of the Lebanese conflict—I stood at this rostrum and appealed to the world's conscience. I asked the Christian world how it could contemplate the massacre which its brothers and sisters were enduring in Lebanon. We received no reply, nor did the Lebanese people, from those leaders of morality in the world who deliver themselves so frequently of homilies to others.

19. Israeli forces entered Lebanon because terrorists in the vicinity of its borders had been making life intolerable for approximately one fifth of the population of my country. Children were growing up in shelters, frequently not seeing the light of day for days on end. Innocent passers-by were being killed on the road by Soviet-supplied Katyusha rockets. Industry was almost

at a standstill. Farmers went into the fields at the risk of their lives. Life in the towns and villages was being paralysed.

20. There is a time in the affairs of a nation when a decision must be made. Failing to reach such a decision can spell disaster. In 1970 King Hussein of Jordan made that decision, driving the PLO out of Jordan in a bitter battle and saving his Kingdom.

21. The tragedy of Lebanon was that its Government over the years did not face up to this problem and lost its independence to a terrorist organization backed by the Syrian Government. In 1982 the Government of Israel faced the same traumatic decision and, like any self-respecting sovereign nation, reacted accordingly. True, there have been differences of opinion in Israel on our Lebanon policy, but there has been no difference of opinion as far as the bulk of the population, as represented in the Knesset, is concerned on the necessity to take steps in order to guarantee the security of the towns and villages in northern Galilee. I wish here to reiterate Israel's declared intention of withdrawing all our forces from Lebanon, subject to satisfactory arrangements being made which will ensure that Lebanon will not be used again as a base for attacks on Israeli territory. As part of this process we have effected a partial withdrawal to the Awali River. On this issue too we experienced the double standards which characterize so many approaches to Israel. When we were in the vicinity of Beirut, we were maligned and attacked and urged to withdraw. When we withdrew, we were maligned and attacked for withdrawing.

22. The facts are that we gave three months' notice to all concerned of our intention to withdraw. We urged all parties to take the necessary actions arising out of this intention. We reiterated time and again our request to the Lebanese army to move in to occupy in advance the positions from which our forces were planning to withdraw. Time and again we were pressured not to withdraw and on a number of occasions we acceded. But when after all these warnings we did withdraw we were maligned for so doing. I wish to emphasize that the partial withdrawal we made to the Awali River is part of an overall withdrawal within the framework of the Agreement reached with the Government of Lebanon which the Government of Israel proposes to make in due course, subject to the necessary satisfactory arrangements being made to guarantee that Lebanon will not be used as a base for hostile action against Israel.

23. Israel's primary interest in embarking on the Peace for Galilee campaign against the PLO was the security of our northern border. For that purpose, and in order to establish relations on a peaceful basis with Lebanon—relations which are definitely an important component of security—we conducted negotiations for an agreement with Lebanon. This Agreement, which was reached following complex negotiations between Israel and Lebanon, with the participation of the United States Government, is the basis for future arrangements. We agreed to the security arrangements included in it, not because they were ideal, but because with the addition of an arrangement of a political and civilian character we saw in it a possible minimum. Let no one imagine that it will be possible to come to an arrangement with Lebanon without the fulfilment of the Agreement. All parties must be aware of this.

24. We are interested in a sovereign and independent Lebanon, free of foreign forces on its soil, capable of acting as necessary to ensure its security and to live in proper relations with its neighbours. We will continue to work for this. We cannot imagine—and we will not agree

to it—that any State of the so-called Rejection Front will be granted a power of veto over the creation of normal relations between Israel and a neighbouring country. We will remove our forces from Lebanon when security conditions are assured.

25. It should be pointed out in this connection that Syria's massive military presence on Lebanese soil increases the danger that Lebanon will once more become a base for attacks on Israel. Therefore, the sooner Syria accedes to the Lebanese Government's demand to remove its occupying army from Lebanon, the better will it be for Lebanon and for the prospects of bringing peace and stability to the entire region.

26. Obviously, one of the problems facing Israel in the field of our relations with the Arab world is that of the Palestinian Arabs, residents of the Judea, Samaria and Gaza districts. It is clear to all in Israel that this is a major problem which must find a solution. We had gone a long way towards solving the problem when our Government signed the Camp David accords. To our regret the Palestinian Arabs and Jordan did not take advantage of the opportunity which Camp David gave them, and rejected Israel's outstretched hand.

27. We regret too that Egypt has discontinued the autonomy talks, despite President Sadat's letter on this subject obliging them to continue such negotiations. The situation today is an anomalous one. Egypt is unwilling to reopen the autonomy negotiations without the participation of Jordan and the Palestinians. Jordan and the Palestinian Arabs for their part are unwilling to enter into such negotiations, and thus we find ourselves in a vicious circle. The tragedy of the Palestinian people has been their leadership, which has invariably rejected compromise. Had they entered the autonomy negotiations which Israel proposed at the outset, the Palestinian Arabs would now have been living in a régime of full autonomy, as laid down by the Camp David accords, and we would by now have been in the phase of negotiations on the final status of the territories. Here is another example of the missed opportunity which characterizes the Palestinian tragedy.

28. In the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Israel has invariably been prepared for compromise. On no issue has the Palestinian Arab leadership been prepared for any form of compromise.

29. The net result has been that Israel has invariably succeeded and the Palestinian cause has invariably failed. Only now that the bloody conflict in the PLO has weakened the reign of terror which the PLO exercised over the Palestinian Arab population are the Palestinian Arabs beginning to give expression to their feeling of betrayal at the hands of the Arab countries and of their leadership over the years.

30. For years I stood at this rostrum and maintained consistently that within the equation of the Arab-Israeli conflict the PLO is an irrelevant organization. An organization with the aims of the PLO as laid down in the Palestinian covenant, including the destruction of Israel, is doomed to failure unless it can do one of two things: either be strong enough to achieve its aims, or have a leadership strong enough to compromise. The PLO was capable of neither, and accordingly doomed itself historically to oblivion. The brutal armed internecine conflict within the PLO today in Tripoli heralds the disappearance of that organization as an independent one. At best it will survive only as an instrument of Syrian policy.

31. I take this opportunity to call on Egypt to return to negotiations on the autonomy arrangements and to call

on Jordan as well as on representatives of the Arabs of the Judea, Samaria and Gaza districts to join such negotiations.

32. It must be clear to all that the Camp David accords constitute the only document agreed on by all concerned and, therefore, the only way to continue the process. Complicated and complex negotiations preceded the signing of this document. Israel cannot and will not depart from it because the Camp David accords were a breakthrough of historic dimensions. It provides a golden opportunity for the Palestinian Arabs, for the first time in their history. It would be a tragedy for them to let this opportunity slip, as they have done in the case of all previous opportunities which were offered to them.

33. One of the major problems attending the approach to our area has been the fact that there has been a tendency to see our problem divorced from the general picture in the area. I think it is right to say that public opinion in the world has to a considerable extent been misled by the over-emphasis on the Israel-Arab conflict in the context of all that is happening in the Middle East. I am not in any way suggesting that our conflict is not an important one. Of course it is, and it merits a determined effort towards its resolution. But it appears to attract obsessive interest to the exclusion of far more important issues in the Middle East.

34. What better example of this distortion of an issue in the context of the problems affecting the general area than the treatment by the General Assembly of the Arab-Israeli conflict. I would say that nothing has contributed more to the degradation of the status of the United Nations in the world and of its standing than the manner in which it has allowed a group of extremist delegations to convert this forum into one which devotes the bulk of its time, at enormous expense, to campaigns of calumny and vilification against my country.

35. Consider the amount of time—reputedly 50 per cent of their time—that representatives have devoted in their deliberations to condemning Israel, and then take a look at the Middle East. The ominous developments which have been and are occurring in the Middle East and are threatening the peace of the world have nothing to do with the Arab-Israeli conflict. Observe the situation all around us, from Afghanistan in the East to Western Sahara in the West. Observe all the conflicts going on at any one given time in this vast area, all unconnected with the Arab-Israeli dispute, and then, perhaps representatives will give the correct perspective to the political picture in our area.

36. The Arab-Israel conflict is not, in my view, the central problem in the Middle East as far as world peace is concerned, because if this conflict is resolved, by whatever means it is resolved, the main centres of bloodshed, warfare and instability will persist. Now look at the situation in our area and compare the scope of attention given by this Assembly in its obsessive preoccupation with condemning Israel with the time devoted to addressing itself to the major centres of strife and bloodshed in our region. Small wonder that so many voices are raised in the world suggesting that this body is failing in its declared purpose.

37. This devaluation of the status of the United Nations is a tragedy. I can but express the hope that those who have the interest of this body at heart will awaken to the dangers attending it. In one day's fighting in the Iran-Iraq war along the Shatt El-Arab, more casualties were suffered by the opposing sides than in all the Arab-Israel wars together since the establishment of the State of Israel. An analysis of press and media coverage of these respective events and of the time taken by this body to

deal with them must surely explain the reason for the unbelievable distortion of the truth by the world community.

38. I am the Head of a State 17 per cent of whose citizens are Arabs. Given the problems which we have faced over the past 35 years and the fact that a number of Arab countries continue to maintain a state of war with Israel, the condition of our Arab population, which is a loyal and integral part of our society, is perhaps the greatest tribute to our free and democratic society. Our Arab and Druse citizens are an integral part of the political life of our country, participating as they do within their own ethnic frameworks or within the general political party framework in the country. We can boast the only free Arab press in the Middle East, published both by the Arabs of Israel and by the Arabs residing in the territories administered by Israel. I am the only Head of State in the Middle East who feels secure enough to stroll freely through the streets of cities with a large Arab population, and does so. Ours is the only society in the whole Middle East in which an Arab who feels that he is being politically wronged may turn to the courts of the land, and does so. The Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Teddy Kollek, received more votes from the Arab population in East Jerusalem in the recent municipal elections than any Arab Mayor had ever received in that city.

39. As I look at the societies of those countries which engage so much of the Assembly's time in decrying Israel I do so with a feeling of intense pride in the people of Israel, which I represent here before you—Jewish, Arab and Druse.

40. It is because we are so proud of our relationship with our own Arab minority, which enjoys all the privileges of a free and open society despite the circumstances in our region that we can raise our voice once again in the Assembly and ask for similar treatment of our minorities in other countries. I appeal once again from this rostrum to the Soviet Union to grant all the rights of equal citizenship in the field of education, religion and human rights to its Jewish citizens and to allow those who wish to join their brothers and sisters in Israel to do so. Is it not a sad commentary on what has happened to our world that on the eve of the year 1984 a Soviet Jewish citizen, Joseph Bigun, was sentenced to seven years in prison and an additional period of five years of exile for the crime of teaching Hebrew, the language of the Prophets, the language in which the immortal prophecy of the Prophet Isaiah facing the entrance to this building was spoken? Let the doors of all countries be open for the free movement of our people, if they so wish, to come to Israel from the Soviet Union, from Syria and from other countries which are restricting their exit.

41. We dream in Israel of the day when peace will come with all our neighbours. Our writers, our poets, our song-writers, our authors and our playwrights—Jewish and Arab—give constant expression to the natural desires of our peoples. We dream of the day when we can make available to the nations of our area the fruits of our research, our scientific advances and our technological developments. These have placed us among the leaders of the world in the development of solar energy, in the technologies of irrigation and fertilization, in the science of turning arid zones and deserts into fruitful orchards and farms, in the development of nuclear medical scanning equipment.

42. All of this and much more we have achieved, and all of it is available to be shared by all the peoples in our region. This is our message to the world and to our own neighbours. From this rostrum I turn once again to our neighbours and to the representatives of the great Arab

nation and the peoples of Islam, in the name of our common heritage and the golden ages of co-operation between our peoples in the past, and say, let us renew the days of the past, for our mutual benefit and for the benefit of the peoples in our region.

43. I once again extend the hand of friendship and co-operation on behalf of my people to our neighbours. Let us begin to talk, let us open a dialogue, let us forget the bitterness of the past and move forward together on a basis of mutual respect and tolerance to a new era which will bring healing, recovery and advance to a region which has, alas, suffered so much.

44. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the President of the State of Israel for the important statement he has just made.

AGENDA ITEM 37

Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia (*continued*)*

45. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The question of the situation in South-East Asia is the subject of discussion in the General Assembly for the fourth time in a row. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches great importance to this debate which should permit us to proceed to a detailed and objective analysis of the situation prevailing in that part of the world and to give due attention to the concrete ideas and proposals aimed at a just and lasting settlement of the problems there.

46. We must state once again today that the situation in South-East Asia continues to be complicated and tense. The course of events during the present year shows once again that the imperialist and hegemonist forces have not renounced their attempts to take strategic revenge and to put this region back into their economic and political orbit.

47. It is common knowledge that the United States considers, and has for a long time considered, this region as a rather important military post for aggressive acts against the socialist and democratic forces and the movements of national liberation. South-East Asia is the area which, in the plans of the Pentagon, constitutes the key link in the whole system of United States bases in Asia and the Pacific. It is precisely this area which, according to United States evaluations, constitutes a point of departure for rapid intervention operations in the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the Middle East and elsewhere, wherever the famous "vital interests" of Washington might appear to be threatened.

48. These imperial considerations determine the concrete policy of the most powerful Western State towards the different countries of South-East Asia. It is an open secret that in the present phase the cutting edge of this policy is directed at the three progressive countries of Indo-China, that is, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

49. The People's Republic of Kampuchea is one of the principal targets of this policy. Washington grants massive military, economic and political support to the remnants of the Pol Pot gangs which have found refuge along the border between Thailand and Kampuchea. With its direct participation, there has been formed the so-called "coalition government" made up of all types

*Resumed from the 55th meeting.

of reactionaries, including the “Khmers Rouges”, who are known for their bloody crimes against their own people. It seems that the process of normalization and renaissance in Kampuchea is not to the taste of the imperialist and hegemonist forces, since that process is an obstacle to their ambition to impose their diktat in South-East Asia.

50. Imperialism continues to intensify its pressure against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. It cannot forgive the Vietnamese people for having so successfully repulsed its aggression or for having firmly committed itself to the path of socialist renewal. In the South China Sea, the Seventh Fleet of the United States carries out spectacular raids and manoeuvres. New anti-Vietnamese provocations are fomented. The world is witnessing a campaign of intensive propaganda, designed to discredit Viet Nam in the eyes of the other Asian countries and to fuel the myth of the “Vietnamese danger”. Slandorous allegations have recently been made that Viet Nam is sending Vietnamese citizens into Kampuchea to change its demographic character. These absurd assertions merely show contempt for the international community which knows quite well that among those behind these allegations are the well known butchers who killed more than 3 million Kampuchean and who tried to solve all the demographic problems of the Kampuchean nation by using the Hitlerite model.

51. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic is also the object of blatantly hostile activities. Brutal attacks on the independence and sovereignty of that country are continuing.

52. The imperialist tactic is based on the classic principle of “divide and rule” and this has a particularly destabilizing impact on the international situation in this part of the world. The United States and its allies are desperately striving to bring to a confrontation the States members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] and the three countries of Indo-China. They are striving to forge a new aggressive military-political bloc in this part of the world which subsequently should merge with other groupings of this nature on the continent and thus have a share in aggravating international tension and exacerbating confrontation, as well as instigating “local wars”, such as the one which in recent days aroused the unanimous indignation of the international community.

53. These are indeed the true causes of the present insecurity in South-East Asia, not the so-called “question of Kampuchea”. The people of Indo-China have already found the final and irreversible solution to the fundamental question of their destiny, namely, the choice of the road to be taken in building their future. They have undergone too much suffering to allow themselves to be left to the mercy of those who, for decades, have subjected them to bombing, chemical warfare, genocide and mass physical extermination, those who reduced their rice paddies and forests to ashes and to a lunar landscape. It can come as no surprise if these peoples continue in the future firmly to fend off the attempts by their alleged benefactors and moral guardians to impose their domination on them.

54. We regard as particularly important at the present stage the fact that a qualitatively new and objectively favourable international situation has been created in South-East Asia by the reunification of Viet Nam, the expulsion of the Pol Pot butchers and the failure of the neo-colonialist schemes in Laos. United over the centuries by geographical, economic and historical circumstances, and above all by their efforts and their common losses in the anti-colonial struggle, these peoples, are in all

logic united in their creative and peaceful activities, and they aspire to create, side by side, lasting peace and co-operation in this region.

55. It is clear that a new political reality has been created in South-East Asia, a reality which is increasingly influencing international relations in the direction of peace, good-neighbourliness and international security. It is a reality that cannot be underestimated.

56. At the international level, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and the People’s Republic of Kampuchea are pursuing a rational policy of peace, a policy whose keystone is the normalization of the situation in South-East Asia and the establishment in the region of relations of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous co-operation. Between January 1980 and July 1983 the Foreign Ministers of those countries held seven meetings, adopting a detailed, complex and realistic programme to improve the political climate in the region and to turn the region into a zone of peace and stability. There has been a great international response to the programme, and its constructive measures are well known to all.

57. In the communiqué issued at the latest of those meetings [A/38/316] the three States of Indo-China reaffirmed their willingness to begin, without pre-conditions, a dialogue with the ASEAN countries, and they stated their readiness to examine any proposal concerning the agenda and the participants in those discussions. They also proposed that the decisions of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983 [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2], should serve as the basis for any possible discussions. The three Indo-Chinese States indicated their willingness to include in the discussions the ASEAN States’ idea of creating in South-East Asia a “zone of peace, freedom and neutrality”.

58. The declaration of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and of the People’s Republic of Kampuchea on the presence of Vietnamese army volunteers in Kampuchea and the decisions taken on the withdrawal each year of a portion of those volunteers were appreciated as signs of good will. What is more, two withdrawals of Vietnamese contingents have already taken place, in July 1982 and May 1983. The communiqué specifically states that it has been agreed that all the Vietnamese contingents will be withdrawn once the external threat has been removed.

59. We are absolutely convinced that the constructive initiatives of the countries of Indo-China accord with the vital interests of all the peoples of South-East Asia. They take into account the political realities of the region, and have been dictated by the sincere desire of those countries to reduce tension and prevent the eruption of a new crisis in this part of the world, which has already suffered so much. These initiatives are based on the belief that there is no objective reason for hostilities and conflicts between the countries of ASEAN and those of Indo-China. In order to normalize the international climate in the region it is obviously particularly important that these proposals receive a prompt response from those to whom they are addressed. The situation will deteriorate still more if pre-conditions continue to be set, if compromise solutions are not sought, and if ultimatums are presented.

60. My delegation reiterates that there is only one way to solve the problems of South-East Asia—that of immediate negotiation based upon the principles of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of each country, mutual respect for the legitimate interests of all the parties, and peaceful coexistence.

61. The fact that the two groups of countries are continuing their useful contacts and dialogue, despite the differences between them, is a promising sign. We share the satisfaction expressed on 7 October by the Foreign Minister of Viet Nam over the common desire of the two groups of countries "to end the confrontation and to negotiate". [See 24th meeting, para. 83.]

62. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria believes that this trend should be encouraged and promoted. We are firmly convinced that once the interference of imperialist and hegemonist forces in the internal affairs of the countries of South-East Asia has been ended, once those forces' selfish designs have been thwarted, the countries of South-East Asia will themselves be able to resolve their present differences.

63. My delegation accordingly believes that the present discussion should contribute to the normalization of the situation in South-East Asia, the renunciation of polemics and the adoption of practical joint measures to transform the region into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation.

64. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first words of the Charter of the United Nations reflect the determination of the peoples of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which has brought untold sorrow to mankind". Unfortunately, through all the years since the signing of the Charter in San Francisco, few regions of the world have experienced that longed-for peace. That is primarily because of the aggressive policies of imperialism, which is not only the source of conflict, but which both promotes and exacerbates conflict.

65. It is the peoples of South-East Asia who have had to make the greatest sacrifice in facing and overcoming, over a period of several decades, aggressions caused by a desire for expansion and intervention. Recent events in the Caribbean remind us forcefully of the criminal aggression of United States imperialism against the people of Viet Nam and other peoples of Indo-China, who, after a long and bloody struggle, succeeded in inflicting a humiliating defeat on the American forces and driving them out of those territories in 1975.

66. In spite of that victory, the Indo-Chinese peoples have not known peace. They continue to pay a high price for independence and freedom, and to resist and reject attempts against them made by those who have always considered South-East Asia to be their sphere of influence and Viet Nam to be their most desired objective.

67. The forces of militarism, colonialism, imperialism and expansionist hegemonism have attempted together to promote hostility between the countries of ASEAN and the countries of Indo-China, time and again making it impossible for reasoned, fruitful and necessary dialogue to replace confrontation and thus to enable all those peoples to shake off the backwardness they inherited from colonial domination and to embark on the difficult course of development, guaranteeing all their children a life of dignity and justice.

68. It might have been thought that the failure of the Yankee armies in Viet Nam eight years ago would herald a time of peace for the long-suffering peoples of Indo-China. It might have been thought too that neighbouring countries that had supported imperialist aggression would have tried to make amends for their past behaviour. But events in Kampuchea following the overthrow of Lon Nol led to a terrible situation in which Pol Pot's paranoia led to genocide against his people, armed incursions against Laos and Thailand and a two-year war all along the border with Viet Nam.

69. The Vietnamese Government did all in its power to put an end to that war, but all its peace proposals were rejected by the followers of Pol Pot, who one day penetrated 15 kilometres into the territory of Viet Nam, then were repulsed, and on the third day bombarded populations 20 kilometres inside Vietnamese territory, massacring innocent civilians in the course of their incursions. The Pol Pot régime became the principal destabilizing element in the region. When the self-sacrificing, heroic people of Viet Nam overthrew the Pol Pot aggressors, helping the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea to achieve victory and save its people from the horror and madness, there was renewed hope that peace, stability and co-operation among the countries of the region would be possible.

70. The events taking place at the same time in Uganda favoured that possibility, but matters took a senseless course. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam had to stave off an invasion by 500,000 soldiers of its powerful neighbour to the north, and the allies of the United States of America refused to recognize the new Government of Kampuchea and embarked once again on a course of confrontation.

71. The South-East Asian countries which supported the Lon Nol coup and the United States aggression against Viet Nam and Kampuchea and which never recognized Sihanouk, when he seemed to be a patriot, or Democratic Kampuchea from the time of its inception to its end, are now attempting to ignore the people's Government of Kampuchea, the sole genuine, true authority in Phnom Penh and throughout the country, and to disinter the political corpses of Sihanouk, Pol Pot and company, giving them the status of Government and State: the Government of a State with neither territory nor population.

72. Those that attempt to maintain this fiction and to use it as a basis for regional policy are not promoting peace or stability. Attempts to isolate and blockade the countries of Indo-China can in the long run only harm the authors of those attempts. Peaceful coexistence on the basis of mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of others constitutes a first step on the path to a future of peace and security and of mutually beneficial, and undoubtedly necessary and fruitful, co-operation.

73. It is peace and security that are most ardently desired by the peoples of South-East Asia. It will be possible to attain those noble objectives only through a natural and irreversible process of mutual trust, which can lay the foundations for understanding and co-operation beneficial to all parties and will have great historical significance for peace and security in that region and other regions of the world. The peoples of Kampuchea, Laos and Viet Nam have tirelessly reiterated the fact that all the disputes among the peoples of the region can be settled through negotiations on the basis of the principles of equality, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the legitimate interests of all parties.

Mr. Elsheikh (Sudan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

74. Statements of this kind have been made at summit meetings and conferences of the Foreign Ministers of the Indo-Chinese countries. In the communiqué issued by the Seventh Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Laos, Kampuchea and Viet Nam, held in July 1983 at Phnom Penh [A/38/316], the three Indo-Chinese countries reaffirmed the need for dialogue, without pre-conditions, between the two groups of countries: the ASEAN countries and the Indo-Chinese countries. They further reiterated their readiness to accept the ASEAN proposal concerning a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in Asia as a starting point for deliberations between the

two groups of countries on the conversion of the region into a zone of peace and stability.

75. The conference of Foreign Ministers of the Indo-Chinese countries also urged the members of ASEAN, in the interest of all the peoples of South-East Asia, to make every effort, together with the Indo-Chinese countries, to reduce tensions and begin negotiations that would promote mutual understanding and exchanges of views in order to settle existing differences.

76. In this context, the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi last March [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex], also emphasized the concern of the Non-Aligned Movement at the conflicts and tensions in that region and stressed the urgent need to reduce those tensions through a comprehensive political solution. It urged the States of the region to settle their disputes through dialogue and negotiation, to establish a zone of peace and stability, and to bring to an end the threat of interference by Powers alien to South-East Asia. That invaluable position of the Conference was adopted by consensus; there was not a single reservation on the part of any Head of State or Government of the Movement, whether of Indo-China or ASEAN. It should thus serve as a solid foundation on which to build promising, constructive dialogue.

77. For our delegation and the majority of States represented here it has been highly satisfying to note that in spite of the many manoeuvres and the great pressure brought to bear over the past year by the Governments of certain countries, factors conducive to peace and stability have emerged in that part of the world. This applies both to the ASEAN countries and to the countries of Indo-China, and in our view demonstrates a growing desire for dialogue. In this context the partial withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea must be an encouraging factor in the negotiating process.

78. Other important factors promoting a climate conducive to the establishment of peace in South-East Asia are no doubt the efforts made by the Secretary-General to promote consultations among the States of the region and the stated desire of many countries outside the region to contribute to the successful development of that process.

79. All this is preparing the framework within which the Member States of the United Nations can unite their efforts to have the General Assembly support and encourage a rapid start to negotiations, by urging all the countries of the region to adopt a constructive position taking into account their shared interests, and all other States to contribute to the attainment of these important objectives and to refrain from any action that might obstruct the process of understanding, which has already begun among the countries of South-East Asia.

80. Cuba hopes that the increasing awareness on the part of all States concerned that in South-East Asia there is an objective possibility for mutual understanding and that any course other than dialogue can only serve to prolong the situation of tension and instability in that explosive region, will bring nearer the day when the beautiful dream of all the peoples in the region to live in peace will become a reality.

81. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Developments in South-East Asia can hardly be understood without bearing in mind the events of history and of the recent past.

82. The region today urgently needs the elimination of political tension. The problems that generate tension can be found mainly in the relations between two groups of countries which are bound together by a shared historical

heritage and common ideals, strong cultural ties and similar economic environments.

83. The history of past decades is one of endless heroic struggles waged by the peoples of the region against foreign conquerors. In those struggles, which called for immense sacrifices, the peoples of South-East Asia have won their independence and, thereby, the right to be masters of their own destinies and to settle their problems free from outside interference. Our sympathy with their struggles is coupled with keen interest and a spirit of helpfulness. And that is easy to understand, for the restoration of peace and stability in South-East Asia on the basis of mutual respect for one another's interests would not only eliminate a regional centre of tension but also take us all a step closer to world peace and security. Besides the innumerable ties of their common past, that is an added element enhancing the responsibility of the nations of the region not to abandon their efforts to remove tension and restore peace in that part of the world.

84. In modern times, the problems of South-East Asia have stemmed from interference by external forces—interference which has compelled the peoples of the region to wage a constant struggle in defence of their freedom and independence. The Indo-Chinese countries have always been targets of foreign aggression. The outside forces involved are still unable to resign themselves to their loss of influence and seek to sow discord among the countries of the region and to raise obstacles to mutual understanding, which now appears to be emerging.

85. It is indisputable that with the persistence of external interference, which is now manifest mainly in the use of political, diplomatic and economic means, solidarity among and co-operation between the countries concerned have assumed particular significance. We welcome the strengthening of co-operation between the three socialist countries of Indo-China not only because closer unity enables them to resist foreign interference with greater success but also because, proceeding from our knowledge of history, we regard this tendency as a positive development towards peace and co-operation in the region as a whole.

86. Since we are following with attention the development of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, we can safely say that those countries have a clear understanding of the lessons of their common past. This is evidenced first and foremost by their peace-loving and non-aligned foreign policies serving the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence.

87. In their relations with each other the three Indo-Chinese countries are striving to strengthen mutual solidarity and to expand co-operation in all areas. As was reaffirmed by their latest summit meeting at Vientiane [A/38/98], they are building their relations by having due regard for each other's interests and seeking to resolve their problems by way of negotiations, in a spirit of mutual understanding and on the basis of respect for national sovereignty. We are convinced that the principles they have laid down to guide their relations are correct and may serve as a basis for the settlement of the problems of the whole region. The diplomatic initiatives of those countries reflect a readiness to conduct their relations with the other nations of the region on the basis of the correct principles applied in their relations with each other. Their initiatives are indicative of sincere endeavours to establish friendly and good-neighbourly relations with the members of ASEAN. Their policies are aimed at finding solutions, at the negotiating table and with mutual regard for each other's interests, to the

problems which emerge under the impact of external forces. We are convinced that that is the only way to bring about peace and stability in South-East Asia, for which an appropriate forum would be provided by the international conference the three countries have proposed.

88. The dialogue started between the two groups of countries is an encouraging sign. It shows that the series of proposals made jointly by Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea for a negotiated solution of the problems between the countries concerned on the basis of equal partnership cannot be disregarded and brushed aside. The continuation of the dialogue would be enhanced if the partners of those countries had a better understanding of the fact that tensions in that part of the world cannot be removed by themselves. A greater readiness to negotiate should also be displayed by the partners of the Indo-Chinese countries, and we earnestly hope for an increase in such an awareness and such a willingness.

89. It is no accident that I am emphasizing the importance of such an understanding, which is a prerequisite to any agreement. It is hard to imagine negotiations between the parties concerned, with a view to creating stability and peace in the region, if one of the parties is unable or unwilling to understand the historical fact that the restoration of the former genocidal Pol Pot régime in the People's Republic of Kampuchea is inconceivable.

90. There are other positive signs that the outlines of peace and stability in South-East Asia can now be glimpsed. Most important of all is the start of a constructive dialogue between the two groups of countries. Many have supported the continuation of that dialogue. Direct talks between the countries involved cannot be replaced by anything else. Those talks can be promoted by the United Nations, but not by interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign State through falsely reducing the complex problems of the region to the so-called question of Kampuchea.

91. The debate on this question has again proved that voicing the differences of view arising out of a misunderstanding of the situation fails to promote an agreement between the parties concerned. The primary task of the United Nations at this moment is to help create the conditions for the countries of the region to discuss their problems in a business-like atmosphere, free from outside interference.

92. Among the positive developments, an important role is played by the realistic and well-intentioned proposals of the Indo-Chinese countries, which are meeting with ever-broader support. Proceeding from those proposals, during the general debate at the current session of the Assembly, the Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has reaffirmed a four-point stand for negotiations which will enhance progress towards an agreement [24th meeting]. The continuation of the dialogue is likewise promoted by the position jointly adopted at the summit conference of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement. Implementation of the proposal of the Mongolian People's Republic to convene a conference of the Asian and Pacific countries with the aim of arriving at an agreement on the non-use of force and non-aggression¹ would make a positive contribution to the settlement of the problems in South-East Asia.

93. The factors I have mentioned reinforce our belief that the conditions are now more favourable for converting the ongoing dialogue into a negotiating process that will bring about security and stability in the region of South-East Asia and will establish a spirit of co-operation. I emphasize this belief of ours not only because my country is bound together with the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea by lasting bonds of friendship and

co-operation, which were forged by their heroic struggles against colonial domination and foreign aggression and are now motivated by their efforts for social and economic progress. My country, guided by its socialist principles of foreign policy, is striving to develop its relations with all nations of the region, including the countries of ASEAN. Our belief is based on the principle of our foreign policy that differences between members of the community of nations should be settled by peaceful means, through negotiations, with due regard for each other's interests. We are confident that the ASEAN countries, by better understanding the lessons of history and the realities of the present, will show greater readiness and flexibility in the matter of substantive talks.

94. Today the Indo-Chinese countries continue clearing away the ruins left by the war and achieving successes in building a society free from exploitation and for the welfare of their peoples. Together with the majority of countries, we are sincerely glad of their achievements.

95. It is our earnest hope that the positive tendencies towards an easing of tension will continue to grow. The creation of peace and stability in the region will be an accomplishment that will make a major contribution to the interests of international peace and security. As in the past, we remain ready to contribute to that pursuit.

96. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): The countries of South-East Asia share a common heritage of basic values and the common experience of having lived through the denigration of colonial domination and subjugation. We have all built our national pride on the legacy of our struggle for national liberation and national emancipation. We have all striven to defend our freedom and identities in the face of continuing major-Power interference in our region and various attempts at economic exploitation, and we are all developing countries determined to achieve the accelerated economic and social growth of our societies so as to give greater content and meaning to the political independence of our peoples. With so many premises in common, it is indeed a paradox that we have yet to succeed in focusing our collective outlook and efforts towards a recognition of our common interests and common future, as countries bound together by inescapable geopolitical and historical realities.

97. It is within that perspective that my delegation would like to view the item now before us, which deals with the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia.

98. Since its inception, ASEAN has constantly endeavoured to promote the realization of those desirable goals of peace, stability and harmonious co-operation among the South-East Asian family of nations. Indeed, far from indulging in mere lip service, the member States of ASEAN have time and again sought to give tangible form to the possible framework and the modalities within which those goals could materialize.

99. I would recall that the 1967 Bangkok Declaration, which gave birth to ASEAN, already contains in itself the basic principles, aims and purposes in order to, as stated in its text: "establish a firm foundation for common action to promote regional co-operation in South-East Asia in the spirit of equality and partnership and thereby contribute towards peace, progress and prosperity in the region".

100. On 27 November 1971 the ASEAN Ministers for Foreign Affairs, meeting at Kuala Lumpur, issued a Declaration in which they enunciated their concept to transform South-East Asia into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality.² This concept embraces a set of guidelines

which would constitute a code of conduct governing relations among the States within the zone as well as with those outside it. It lists the measures and the voluntary restraints in policies to be commonly agreed upon and undertaken by the regional States as well as the external Powers, and especially the major Powers. As a matter of course, it reiterates the strict observance of those basic principles of inter-state relations without which peace, stability or any co-operative endeavour in any region of the world becomes illusory—the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference and non-intervention and abstention from the threat or use of force in the settlement of disputes.

101. Subsequently, on 24 February 1976, the ASEAN Heads of State and Government gave further substance and impulsion to the concept by entering into a Treaty of Amity and Co-operation in South-East Asia³ and opening it for accession by all other States in the region.

102. As can thus be seen, the ASEAN member States have given ample proof of their unremitting efforts and commitment to work concretely towards the objectives of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia. It is, indeed, encouraging to note that since its launching 12 years ago the proposal for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia² has won growing recognition by the international community here at the United Nations, in the non-aligned movement and elsewhere, as a viable blueprint for greater harmony and security in the region. Recently, ASEAN welcomed the affirmation by Viet Nam and Laos that they too could accept it as a basis for pursuing common efforts towards these goals.

103. However, as we all know, to define long-term objectives is often the easier part of so many of our endeavours. To concur on the ways and means of reaching agreed goals invariably proves to be the real challenge. What is more, the building of a lasting structure of peace within a community, whether nationally or regionally, requires, in our view, the fundamental ingredients of mutual trust and mutual respect among its members and at least a degree of tranquillity. In the present environment of South-East Asia, we cannot but regretfully observe that even these minimal requirements are still short of being met.

104. In a region which for so long has been denied the opportunity for peaceful progress, in freedom and independence, it is the situation in and involving Kampuchea which today constitutes the primary source of tension and conflict. The continued presence of foreign forces in Kampuchea and the persistent denial of the inherent right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny, carry ominous implications for the future of regional harmony and security. They do not only pose a major impediment to the attainment of peace, stability and co-operation, but have undeniably dealt a severe setback to all earlier efforts towards these goals.

105. Durable peace cannot be imposed by force of arms. Stability cannot be sustained under the yoke of foreign domination. Co-operation cannot be advanced at the expense of the basic rights of any State.

106. For these reasons, Indonesia remains convinced that it is both relevant and urgent that the problems and perceived security threats arising from the situation in Kampuchea be resolved as quickly as possible. If the sponsors of the item presently under discussion are serious in their desire to achieve peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia, then they should recognize that a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem must be the necessary first step towards that objective.

107. There may be other problems within South-East Asia which would benefit from regional consultation and dialogue leading towards their amicable resolution. But none of these possess the urgency and pervasive ramifications of the conflict in and around Kampuchea. Hence, to deny the central relevance of the Kampuchean problem to the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia is to deny reality and to impart a sense of artificiality to our deliberations.

108. Indonesia, therefore, reiterates its appeal to Viet Nam and Laos to see it as in their interests also to co-operate in finding a speedy and just solution to the Kampuchean problem and, to this end, to show greater flexibility and seriousness in pursuing a process of genuine dialogue and consultations with ASEAN.

109. Only when the tragic episode of Kampuchea is brought to a mutually satisfactory conclusion, can the vision of one South-East Asia, at peace within itself and with the neighbouring Powers, co-operating for common progress and stability, be finally realized.

110. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): In his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General noted that:

“There are a number of current problems affecting international peace, security and co-operation which cry out for a central instrument of co-operative effort through which Governments can control conflict and work out solutions.” [A/38/I, p. 1.]

111. One of these problems, in our view, is the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia. As we all know, South-East Asia, because of its geopolitical and strategic position, has long been a locus of interaction of the selfish interests of colonialist, imperialist and expansionist forces, but the aggressive nature of their policies and actions towards the peoples of this region were seen most strikingly after the Second World War. One after the other, sometimes engaging in open or concealed alliances with one another, these foreign forces converted South-East Asia into one of the major centres of tension and conflict. They have steadily fomented hostility among the peoples of the region, setting one against the other, and invoking their notorious policy of “divide and conquer”, frequently engaging in military and other types of adventures to prevent independent development, in particular of the peoples of Indo-China, in order to impose on them their own order and to turn them away from their chosen course.

112. One has only to mention in this connection the dirty war waged by the United States in Indo-China which ended in a shameful defeat for its instigators. One could also mention the shameful collapse of those who were behind the monstrous “social experiment” which led to the genocide of a whole people, the people of Kampuchea, the aim of that experiment being to convert the country into a springboard for their expansion in the region. Today, those imperialist and hegemonist circles, having failed to learn the lessons of the recent past, continue their adventurist course by intervening in the internal affairs of the South-East Asian countries. Some have unilaterally declared the region a zone linked with their vital interests, but all of them, following their so-called parallel strategic interests, are trying to eliminate the historic conquests of the three peoples and countries of Indo-China, and are increasing tension in the region. To this end, they intensify their propagandistic hysteria around the so-called question of Kampuchea which has, in fact, already been resolved, and to the benefit of the people of Kampuchea itself, thanks to the help, assistance and support of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

113. The Mongolian delegation wishes once again to express its profound regret that the seat of Kampuchea in our Organization is still being usurped by a group of individuals who essentially represent the butchers of Pol Pot and who hide behind the banner of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, which is nothing more than a political ghost. It is precisely because of this—to say the least—abnormal situation that the United Nations today, as has been recognized in a number of statements, is not in a position to play an appropriate political role in reducing tension in South-East Asia. It is obvious that the attempts to impose the position of one group of States of that region without taking into account the legitimate interests of the other group are entirely pointless and cannot help the efforts to bring about a settlement of any disputes that still exist between them.

114. However, experience shows that there is another more realistic and more encouraging approach, which is that of the non-aligned movement. It is well known with what satisfaction the world greeted the decision of the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in March of this year at New Delhi, once again to leave vacant the seat of Kampuchea in the Movement and its urgent appeal to all States of South-East Asia “to undertake a dialogue which would lead to the resolution of differences among themselves and the establishment of durable peace and stability in the area, as well as the elimination of involvement and threats of intervention by outside Powers”. [See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 113.]

115. South-East Asia can become a zone of peace, stability and mutually beneficial co-operation if the principal cause of existing tension is eliminated, namely, selfish interference from outside, and if the two groups of States are able to overcome their lack of confidence in and mistrust of each other and instead are governed by a profound awareness of their common fate and the common interests of their peoples. The road to this lies not through fruitless confrontation but rather through immediate dialogue and negotiations between the parties. Fruitful dialogue can be based only on mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. What is necessary is a sober calculation of existing realities and legitimate interests, including the security interests of each party.

116. This is the spirit that in my delegation's view characterizes the constructive position of the three Indo-Chinese countries in their persistent desire to find mutually acceptable solutions and their willingness to do everything possible to ensure that there should at last be peace and tranquillity in South-East Asia. All this can be seen from the broad spectrum of proposals made by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, in particular at their summit Conference at Vientiane in February of this year [A/38/98] and at the Seventh Conference of their Ministers for Foreign Affairs, which took place in July of this year at Phnom Penh [A/38/316].

117. Thanks to the efforts of the countries in Indo-China, in recent years we have seen a certain shift in the direction of dialogue and negotiation, and the international community should give this tendency all possible support.

118. The position of the Indo-Chinese States regarding the settlement of the situation relating to Kampuchea and lessening tension in South-East Asia is perfectly clear. As was stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam on 7 October in the general debate in the Assembly this year, it consists in:

“First, the total withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteers from Kampuchea . . . carried out concurrently with the complete cessation of the Chinese threat, of the use of Pol Pot supporters to impede the recovery of the Kampuchean people, and of the use of the Thai territory against the three Indo-Chinese countries, concurrently with the disarming of the supporters of Pol Pot and the punishment of the genocidal Pol Pot criminals. The People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam have decided to withdraw some of the Vietnamese volunteers from Kampuchea each year and will effect a total withdrawal once the peace and security of Kampuchea are assured. Secondly, the countries of Indo-China and China should sign a treaty of non-aggression and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The two groups of countries, Indo-China and ASEAN, [should] agree on establishing a zone of peace and stability in South-East Asia, based on the ASEAN proposal for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality and on the proposal of the Indo-Chinese countries. Thirdly, all countries should respect the sovereign right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own affairs. Fourthly, all sides should acknowledge some form of international guarantee for the agreements reached.” [24th meeting, para. 79.]

119. The Mongolian People's Republic is in accord with this position and feels that it is dictated by the realities of the existing situation as well as by a sincere desire speedily to put an end to the dangerous state of tension in that region through political dialogue.

120. The Mongolian People's Republic, as an Asian country which has strong views on the inadmissibility of aggression or the use of force in relations among States of the Asian and Pacific regions, is anxious to see the rapid conversion of one of these important regions, South-East Asia, into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation. This would be very significant for the peace and stability not only of the Asian continent, but also of the whole world.

121. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The situation in South-East Asia continues to be a cause of concern for all who are anxious to see the strengthening of peace and security in Asia and the whole world. The Soviet delegation feels that the United Nations cannot stand aloof from efforts aimed at normalizing the situation in South-East Asia. Therefore we fully support consideration at the current session of the General Assembly of the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia.

122. There are various explanations for the continuance of tension in that region.

123. According to one view, the basis of everything is the alleged failure to settle the so-called question of Kampuchea and the presence of Vietnamese volunteers in the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

124. We, however, hold a different opinion inasmuch as the question of Kampuchea was resolved five years ago when the Kampuchean people overthrew the Pol Pot régime and the country set out on its path of national rebirth. This is the process that is being actively furthered by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. The temporary presence of Vietnamese volunteers in Kampuchea ensures that country's security and eliminates the threat of a return of the former régime of bloody genocide.

125. If one looks at things objectively, one can hardly fail to recognize that the true reason for the tense and unstable relations in South-East Asia is the continuing

interference of the external forces of imperialism and hegemonism. The present policy of the United States of America, aimed at achieving political, military, strategic and economic superiority, is being extended to the Asian continent as well, including South-East Asia. As is known, the United States has included that region and many others in the sphere of its so-called vital interests. The United States artificially heaps contradictions and stirs up confrontations among the countries of South-East Asia.

126. In this agitation around the so-called question of Kampuchea and scaring everyone with an invented "Vietnamese threat", the United States is pressing the countries of ASEAN along the path of militarization and converting an association into a military political bloc. At the same time, the United States is seeking the right to use the territories of the ASEAN countries for its strategic purposes and is increasing its military presence in the region.

127. In 1981 the United States made arrangements with Thailand to use the military bases in U Tapao and Don Muang. In May 1982 the Philippine-American Committee of Mutual Defence concluded the elaboration of an operative plan for the joint defence of the Philippines, part of which is an agreement granting the Pentagon the right to unhindered exploitation of the largest American military bases in the Philippines. Those bases are to be used as staging posts for the Rapid Deployment Forces with a possible theatre of operations extending as far as the Persian Gulf. If so desired, this list could be extended even further.

128. Of course, maintaining the complex situation in South-East Asia leaves its mark and increases the general tension in international relations caused by the imperialist policy of the United States of America and the Governments which support it, a policy aimed at intensifying the arms race and changing the relationship of forces in the world arena, as well as at crushing the national liberation movements.

129. However, in our view, despite all the regional and international difficulties, there are a number of possibilities for improving and stabilizing the relationships in South-East Asia between the countries of Indo-China and those of ASEAN. The premises for this are the long-standing historic contacts among the countries of the region, the general interest of their peoples in peace and, finally, their general demand for an accelerated social and economic development, inasmuch as all those States belong to the group of developing countries.

130. One can note with satisfaction that the tendency to a political settlement and normalization of the situation in South-East Asia, although a slow one, none the less is becoming perceptible. An example of the development of useful political contacts are the bilateral and multilateral meetings among Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States of that region, both in their capitals and at various international forums. This is a good beginning which we hope will yield fruit.

131. The idea of the necessity of a dialogue between the two groups of countries of South-East Asia is acquiring ever greater international support. The Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, at their Seventh Conference at New Delhi in March of this year, stated in their Political Declaration their conviction of the necessity of reducing tension in South-East Asia through a comprehensive political settlement and urged all States of the region: "to undertake a dialogue which would lead to the resolution of differences among themselves and the establishment of durable peace and stability

in the area, as well as the elimination of involvement and threats of intervention by outside Powers." [A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 113.] The New Delhi Conference called on all States to give their fullest support to efforts undertaken for the early establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in that region.

132. The provisions of the Political Declaration adopted in New Delhi with respect to the situation in South-East Asia were consolidated at the Meeting held in New York from 4 to 7 October 1983 by Ministers and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly [A/38/495].

133. One can also note that during the course of the current session many countries have expressed themselves in favour of a settlement of the problems of South-East Asia through negotiations among the countries of the region.

134. What concrete path can be followed to achieve that goal? It seems to us that there is an answer to that question. It is very important that the decisions of the Seventh summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries on the situation in South-East Asia have been adopted by both groups of countries in the region.

135. As far back as November 1971, the ASEAN Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held at Kuala Lumpur, adopted a Declaration on Peace, Freedom and Neutrality² in which they expressed their determination to make every effort to ensure the recognition of South-East Asia as a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, without interference in any form by any other countries. At the meeting of Heads of State or Government on 24 February 1976, the ASEAN countries which signed a treaty of amity and co-operation³ once again expressed themselves in favour of continuing all efforts to transform South-East Asia into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality.

136. The countries of Indo-China, in turn, more than once have expressed their desire to establish with all States of the region relations of good-neighbourliness and to join their struggle to reduce international tension. This course has found concrete embodiment in the proposals of the Indo-Chinese countries on the normalization of the situation in South-East Asia and its conversion into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation.

137. At the conference of the top-level leaders, held in February of this year at Vientiane [A/38/98], and at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, held at Phnom Penh in July [A/38/316], willingness was expressed to develop good relations with their neighbours and all other countries, regardless of their political or social system, on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence.

138. The States of Indo-China have urged the members of ASEAN to solve all existing disputes through negotiations in a spirit of good-neighbourliness, peaceful coexistence, co-operation and friendship, without permitting other countries to interfere in the region's affairs, to sow discord or to use the territory of one State of the region to carry out actions against another. They have also called for joint efforts to transform South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation. To this end they once again proposed that agreements be concluded with the ASEAN countries on non-aggression and the normalization of relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. They also called for an international

conference of the South-East Asian countries in order to settle questions of peace and stability in that region.

139. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the three countries of Indo-China, at their Conference in July 1983, proposed to the members of ASEAN a dialogue without any pre-conditions, declaring their willingness to accept the proposals of the ASEAN countries to create a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia as a basis for discussion of the question of converting that region into a zone of peace and stability.

140. These proposals were striking and convincing manifestations of the good will of Viet Nam, Laos and people's Kampuchea and their willingness to establish normal and stable relations with the ASEAN countries. Thus we can note that today a certain basis for establishing such relations exists in the form of proposals advanced by States belonging to the two South-East Asian groupings.

141. Of course the policy of China has a considerable impact on the situation in the region. In the relationships between the countries of Indo-China and China there are some fairly complex problems, which were thoroughly discussed and profoundly analysed in the course of the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly by the heads of delegations of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic. However, it can be stated with perfect confidence that there is a possibility of a settlement of these problems as well. As representatives know, the countries of Indo-China have expressed their willingness to conclude with the People's Republic of China an agreement on non-aggression and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

142. The Soviet Union, as was stated during the recent visit of the Soviet party-governmental delegation to the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, supports the constructive proposals of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam aimed at normalizing Vietnamese-Chinese relations. Unfortunately, we have to state that the Chinese side has so far rejected these constructive proposals and continues to adhere to its previous line with regard to South-East Asia, which is one of the reasons for the tension in that region.

143. The Soviet Union has consistently favoured a stable peace in Asia. We are determined to further the establishment in South-East Asia of relations of peace, stability and genuine good-neighbourliness and are willing to co-operate with all who strive for the same goals. These are the objectives of the initiatives of the Soviet Union, designed to deter preparations for war, curb the arms race and reduce tension in the Far East and South-East Asia.

144. The Soviet delegation feels that the United Nations can and should make a constructive contribution to the settlement of existing problems in South-East Asia, taking into account the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the region, and to promoting the development among them of relations of good-neighbourliness and co-operation.

145. Of course, we can hardly fail to recognize that it would be unrealistic to count on a rapid settlement of all existing political problems in relations between the countries of Indo-China and the members of ASEAN in view of the complex and multi-faceted nature of the political, social and other realities in South-East Asia and the continuing foreign interference in the affairs of the region. At the same time, it must be recognized also that only in conditions of constructive dialogue between all the countries of South-East Asia will it be possible to bring about a genuine improvement in relations among

them. Without negotiation and co-operation, without an attempt at mutual understanding, there will only be an intensification of the confrontation and the already unstable and disturbed situation in that part of the world will become worse.

146. Of course, the trend towards negotiation and improved relations among the two groups of South-East Asian countries can advance and develop only if the ASEAN countries adopt a more realistic position and do not strive to impose their own one-sided pre-conditions of negotiation on the countries of Indo-China. Unfortunately, such attempts are continuing, but international practice shows that the establishment of good-neighbourly relations on the basis of mutual respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit is the true, correct path which alone can lead to the settlement of the region's problems and convert South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation.

147. We hope that discussion of this question at the current session of the General Assembly will make a positive contribution to the development of dialogue between the countries of Indo-China and the members of ASEAN and contribute to normalizing the situation in South-East Asia.

148. Mr. THIOUNN Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): Since 1979, at every session, the General Assembly has adopted resolutions condemning the Vietnamese invasion and occupation of Kampuchea and demanding the total and unconditional withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea in order to make it possible for its people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination without any foreign interference. Those resolutions, always adopted by an overwhelming, four-fifths majority, stress that only a comprehensive political solution to the problem of Kampuchea will make it possible to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia, in accordance with the wishes of all the countries of the region. On 27 October—just two weeks ago—by adopting resolution 38/3 the General Assembly reiterated that firm position with remarkably consistent strength.

149. Furthermore, since the item which we were considering has been on its agenda, the General Assembly has never been able to take any decision on the question. The reason for this is clear and the verdict allows of no appeal: peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia will be possible only when Viet Nam applies the relevant United Nations resolutions on Kampuchea and respects the Charter of the United Nations.

150. To this reasonable, clear, just and firm position of the General Assembly, Viet Nam has always responded with insult and disdain. Moreover, defying world-wide condemnation, it continues to apply the law of the jungle and gangster logic in international relations.

151. While Viet Nam's representative speaks here of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia, his country continues to send new military reinforcements to Kampuchea, backed by great amounts of Soviet war material and, in the absence of military successes, it is mobilizing its forces in the border regions between Kampuchea and Thailand in order to launch new attacks and slaughter against the civilian refugee camps during the forthcoming dry season. Furthermore, in spite of being bogged down in Kampuchea, Viet Nam is intensifying its crimes and repression against the Kampuchean people and has already sent more than 600,000 Vietnamese settlers to establish themselves in Kampuchea within the framework of its Vietnamization policy with a view to

absorbing Kampuchea into the Indo-Chinese Federation, intended subsequently to become Greater Viet Nam.

152. For the fourth consecutive year now we have been obliged to witness a farce where those who are both authors and protagonists show us how they excel at an art that is characteristic of them, that is, sophisticated rhetoric. At the beginning the scenario startles spectators, gives rise to sarcastic smiles and banter on their part, while enabling them nevertheless to gauge the full arrogant hypocrisy and bold cynicism of the main author and protagonist, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, which has become a typical case. But today, when every aspect of the problem of Kampuchea resulting from the Vietnamese invasion has become clear to all, this drama no longer amuses anyone. Quite the contrary, it is tiring and offensive because by its stubborn repetition it has become an affront to all those who are sincerely dedicated to the noble ideals of peace, justice and freedom and who continue to believe in the respectable and indispensable role of the United Nations in the safeguarding of international peace and security.

153. It has been clear for four years that by placing this item on the agenda of the General Assembly, Viet Nam's main objectives are: first, to divert the attention of the international community from the problem of Kampuchea and make it forget the United Nations resolutions on that problem; secondly, to make the international community accept the *fait accompli* of the Vietnamese invasion and occupation of Kampuchea and thus to endorse the formation of the Indo-Chinese Federation under Viet Nam's domination, which Hanoi today euphemistically calls "group of Indo-Chinese countries"; thirdly, to present Viet Nam as the apostle of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia and to place responsibility for tension in the region on other countries, thus transforming Viet Nam from an instigator of wars of aggression and expansion into a victim.

154. The scenario designed and played out by Viet Nam in the General Assembly for four years now is part of a campaign of lies, falsifications and manoeuvrings aimed at the same objectives and includes, *inter alia*, the proposal for a so-called regional conference or international conference on South-East Asia, the clamour over the so-

called partial withdrawals of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea, or over the so-called Chinese threat.

155. From the very outset, the General Assembly has clearly indicated that it would not fall into this trap.

156. This Vietnamese show makes us waste time, money and energy. It is a grave affront to the honour, seriousness and respectability of the United Nations. My delegation believes that it would be reasonable and appropriate to put an end to it and that the General Assembly should consider agenda item 37 only when Viet Nam has implemented the United Nations resolutions on Kampuchea and the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea. This would respond both to the well-understood interests of Viet Nam and its people, to the interests of all the countries and peoples in the region and to the interests of peace and security in South-East Asia and in the world. Only then will debates on peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia be justified and lead to positive resolutions.

157. The Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea will then be ready to make an active contribution. As was clearly stated on 25 October by Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, the President of Democratic Kampuchea, during the debate on the situation in Kampuchea:

"The Kampuchean people threaten no one. They want only to live peacefully under their own laws.

"With regard to the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, our attitude will become friendly, in conformity with the five principles of peaceful coexistence (Panca Sila), as soon as it accepts its obligation to implement fully the just United Nations resolutions on Kampuchea, resolutions which alone are capable of ensuring stability, peace and progress in South-East Asia." [See 35th meeting, paras. 51-52.]

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See A/36/586, annex.

² See A/C.1/1019.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1025, No. 15063, p. 319.